

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presented herein is requested. Claims 1-18 are pending in the present application; of these, claims 1-8 are withdrawn. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner rejected Claims 9 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Offord et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,901,075) in view of Gurcan (U.S. Patent No. 4,985,902) and further in view of Nikias et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,282,225).

The Examiner also rejected Claims 10, 11, 12 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Offord et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,901,075) in view of Gurcan further in view of Nikias et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,282,225) and further in view of Chin Hwa Lee et al. (*Signals, Systems and Computers* 1994, Vol. 1, pages 89-93).

Drawings

Applicants submit that the above amendments to the drawings do not make any substantive changes or introduce any new material, but are simply the correction of typographical errors. Applicants further submit that the amendments are consistent with the specification as originally submitted. Therefore, approval and entry of the above amendments are respectfully requested.

Applicants have concurrently filed herewith a Letter to the Official Draftsperson submitting formal drawings to replace the originally filed informal drawings, including corrected drawing informalities indicated in this amendment.

Specification

Applicants provide herewith amendments to the specification. The amendments to the specification are made by presenting marked up replacement paragraphs which identify changes made relative to the immediate prior version.

The changes made are primarily typographical or grammatical in nature, or involve minor clarifications of awkward wordings.

Applicants believe these changes add no new matter to the application and are fully supported by the original disclosure.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected Claims 9 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Offord et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,901,075) in view of Gurcan (U.S. Patent No. 4,985,902) and further in view of Nikias et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,282,225). To establish a prima facie case of obviousness three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation of, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference(s) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

The rejection contends that Gurcan teaches that the number of taps is equal to the total number of symbols. With respect, the Examiner's argument is traversed. Gurcan discloses a reference tap position being at least equal to the number of samples in the impulse response of the channel. The sample S_n is composed of energy from symbols T_1 , T_2 , T_3 and T_4 . Thus, "samples" is not the same as "symbols." On the contrary, in the Applicants' Specification, p.29, l.19, the number of taps is equal to the number of symbols per sample set, i.e., $(2L + 1)$.

Applicants thus respectfully submit that claims 9 and 13 are not rendered obvious by the Offord Patent when considered alone or in combination with Gurcan or Nikias. Claims 14-15 depend from claim 13 and therefore contain all the limitations of that independent claim. Since the Offord, Gurcan, and Nikias references do not render claims 9 and 13-15, unpatentable Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections thereof be withdrawn by the Examiner.

The Examiner also rejected Claims 10, 11, 12 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Offord et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,901,075) in view of Gurcan further in view of Nikias et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,282,225) and further in view of Chin Hwa Lee et al. (*Signals, Systems and Computers* 1994, Vol. 1, pages 89-93).

As mentioned above, Gurcan does not disclose that the number of taps is equal to the total number of symbols. Offord, Nikias and Chin Hwa Lee also do not provide this feature.

Applicants thus respectfully submit that claims 9 and 13 are not rendered obvious by the Offord Patent when considered alone or in combination with Gurcan, Nikias, or Chin Hwa Lee. Claims 10, 11, 12, and 16 depend from claims 9 and 13 and therefore contain all the limitations of those independent claims. Since the Offord, Gurcan, Nikias, and Chin Hwa Lee references do not render claims 10, 11, 12, and 16, unpatentable Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections thereof be withdrawn by the Examiner.

REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that all pending claims in the application are patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 15, 2004

By: *Arti A. Kane / Limited Recognition*
Arti A. Kane, Limited Recognition
858-845-2650

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 651-4125
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502

IN THE DRAWINGS

Please amend the drawings as follows:

In FIG. 8, please insert Memory Storage Device 732 to the right of Coefficient Adjustment 730.